

REMARKS

Claims 18, 19, 22-30, 36 and 40 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 2, 4-10, 21, 31-35, 37-39, 41 and 48-57 have been cancelled. Claims 36 and 40 have been amended. Basis for the amendments can be found throughout the specification, claims and drawings as originally filed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7, 31, 33-35, 38 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Feuerstein, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,141,565). Claims 1-5, 7, 31, 33-35, 38 and 39 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 6 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feuerstein, et al. in view of what was well-known in the art (see MPEP 2144.03). Claims 6 and 32 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-10, 37 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feuerstein, et al. in view of Corbett (U.S. Pat. No. 6,438,116). Claims 8-10, 37 and 41 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 21, 48-51, 52 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Feuerstein, et al. in view of Corbett and further in view of Tiedmann,

Jr. (U.S. Pat. 5,926,470). Claims 21, 48-51, 52 and 55 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 52, 53, 56 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Feuerstein, et al., Corbett and Tiedmann, Jr., et al. as applied to Claim 21 above, and further in view of what was well known in the art (see MPEP 2144.03). Claims 52, 53, 56 and 57 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 18, 19 and 22-30 are allowed.

Claims 36 and 40 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 36 depended from Claim 33 which depended from Claim 31. Claim 36 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claims 33 and 31 and is thus believed to be allowable.

Claim 40 depended from Claim 38 which depended from Claim 31. Claim 40 has been amended to independent form to include the limitations of Claims 38 and 31 and is thus believed to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests

that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 2, 2005

By: 
Michael J. Schmidt, 34,007

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MJS/pmg